

From: [Bradbury, Mike@DWR](mailto:Bradbury.Mike@DWR)
To: [Nagy, Meegan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Nagy.Meegan@usace.army.mil); [Simmons, Zachary M SPK](mailto:Simmons.Zachary.M.SP@usace.army.mil); [Michelle Banonis](mailto:Michelle.Banonis@usace.army.mil); [Marc Ebbin \(mebbin@emsllp.com\)](mailto:Marc.Ebbin@emsllp.com); [Brian Plant \(bplant@rmenvirolaw.com\)](mailto:Brian.Plant@rmenvirolaw.com); [Karen Shaffer \(kshaffer@gibsonandskordal.com\)](mailto:Karen.Shaffer@gibsonandskordal.com); [Witzman, Jean@DWR](mailto:Witzman.Jean@DWR); [Bogdan, Kenneth M.@DWR](mailto:Bogdan.Kenneth.M.@DWR)
Cc: Michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil; [Foresman, Erin](mailto:Foresman.Erin@epa.gov); [Ann Stine](mailto:Ann.Stine@usace.army.mil); [Gardner, Chuck@HGCPM](mailto:Gardner.Chuck@HGCPM); [Enos, Cassandra@DWR](mailto:Enos.Cassandra@DWR)
Subject: RE: Federal Cooperating Agency Review for the BDCP Recirculated EIR/Supplemental EIS
Date: Monday, April 06, 2015 1:54:59 PM

Please let me know your availability on the following days for a BDCP EIS meeting:

Friday, April 10
Monday, April 13
Tuesday, April 14
Wednesday, April 15
Friday, April 17

Michael Bradbury
Program Manager II, BDCP Permitting
Department of Water Resources
901 P Street, Suite 411b, Sacramento, CA 95814
Cell (916) 207-0803
Office (916) 651-2987

-----Original Message-----

From: Nagy, Meegan G SPK [<mailto:Meegan.G.Nagy@usace.army.mil>]
Sent: Friday, April 03, 2015 3:51 PM
To: Bradbury, Mike@DWR; Simmons, Zachary M SPK; Michelle Banonis
Cc: Michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil; foresman.erin@epa.gov; Ann Stine; Gardner, Chuck@HGCPM; Enos, Cassandra@DWR
Subject: RE: Federal Cooperating Agency Review for the BDCP Recirculated EIR/Supplemental EIS

Mike,

I am unavailable on the 9th. Could you propose some alternate dates/times?

Thanks,
Meegan

US Army Corps of Engineers - Sacramento District
Phone: 916-557-7257
Fax: 916-557-6877
Cell: 916-807-0025

-----Original Message-----

From: Bradbury, Mike@DWR [<mailto:Mike.Bradbury@water.ca.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 5:06 PM
To: Simmons, Zachary M SPK; Michelle Banonis
Cc: Nagy, Meegan G SPK; Jewell, Michael S SPK; foresman.erin@epa.gov; Ann Stine; Gardner, Chuck@HGCPM; Enos, Cassandra@DWR
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Federal Cooperating Agency Review for the BDCP Recirculated EIR/Supplemental EIS

Zachary,

The DWR 404 team would like to meet with you, Meegan, and others you'd like to include, next Thursday if you are available. We'd like to integrate the USACE team into the EIS update process to the greatest extent possible. At the first meeting we'd like to go through your comments below, and give you a status report on our work to address them.

Please let me know if next Thursday, April 9 will work for you.

Thanks,

Mike

Michael Bradbury
Program Manager II, BDCP Permitting
Department of Water Resources
901 P Street, Suite 411b, Sacramento, CA 95814

Cell (916) 207-0803

Office (916) 651-2987

From: Simmons, Zachary M SPK [<mailto:Zachary.M.Simmons@usace.army.mil>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:27 PM
To: Michelle Banonis
Cc: Nagy, Meegan@usace.army.mil; Michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil; Bradbury, Mike@DWR; foresman.erin@epa.gov; Ann Stine
Subject: RE: Federal Cooperating Agency Review for the BDCP Recirculated EIR/Supplemental EIS

Hello Ms. Banonis,

Please see the following comments from the Corps for Section 2 for the Recirculated DEIR/Supplemental DEIS. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact Meegan Nagy or myself.

1. We are unclear how our comments on the Draft EIR/EIS will be addressed in the supplemental Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS (RDEIR/SDEIS). We recommend you prepare a response to comments table that shows us where and how our comments are being addressed in the RDEIR/SDEIS and schedule a meeting to specifically discuss the comment responses.

2. A conclusion of no significant impact was made for impacts to navigation in the Draft EIR/EIS. The Draft EIR/EIS did not include an adequate analysis or data to support this conclusion. We provided DWR with instructions and example of how the navigation analysis must be done, consistent with how we have been regulating DWR's operations of Clifton Court Forebay for the past 35 years. We also walked DWR through the needed analysis over a two hour meeting. Will the requested analysis on navigation be included in the RDEIR/SDEIS?

3. This document refers primarily to the analysis for Alternative 4 and 4A. All revisions and additional analyses must be completed at the same level for each of the proposed alternatives, including the no action alternative.

4. The RDEIR/SDEIS should include a statement somewhere in the introduction that this document is intended to meet the NEPA requirements for the USACE as a cooperating federal agency for permitting actions under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Sections 10 and 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Example language can be found in Section S.12.3 of the Summary for Volume 1 of the April 2012, Ca High-Speed Train Merced to Fresno Section Project EIR/EIS.

5. The following are specific comments on the administrative draft Section 2.

a. Section 2.1.2: The last paragraph states that the environmental factors were found to be essentially unchanged as a result of changes in operations across alternatives. Is this referring to Alternative 4A compared to the previous alternatives, or all of the alternatives compared to the environmental baseline?

b. Section 2.1.4: The RDEIR/SDEIS must not include the determination of “uncertain” for any impact. It is not clear if this was corrected for all impacts. A determination of significance should be made for each impact based on the available data. We request that Reclamation consult with this office if a NEPA determination of significance is unable to be made for a specific impact.

c. Section 2.5: For any environmental commitments or mitigation that will alter a Federally authorized project, analysis should be included within the RDEIR/SDEIS to disclose impacts associated with those actions. These commitments/mitigation measures are tied to the primary alteration therefore will need analysis and design prior to permitting decision being made on the intake structures.

d. Section 2.5.1 references “complete water conveyance facility project footprints developed by DWR’s Division of Engineering”. A copy of these footprints should be provided to USACE to have a better understanding of the proposed facility in relation to the Federally authorized project.

e. Section 2.5.4: The documents states that the projects described “have already undergone CEQA/NEPA review”. USACE is unaware of completed NEPA review for restoration of the Southport area. The West Sacramento Levee Improvement Program – Southport Project NEPA document is not yet final. The NEPA document addresses only the impacts associated with that project. The West Sacramento General Reevaluation Report EIS/EIR is also a draft document.

f. Section 2.5.4: This section further states “accordingly provide meaningful examples of the activities that could result from implementation of CM3–CM11”. While these may be examples, actual mitigation sites and the associated impacts should be included.

g. Section 2.5.4.1: The Lower Yolo Ranch Tidal Restoration Project is referenced as an activity that could result from CM3-CM11. This restoration project is being done in response to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Delta Smelt BiOp (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2008) and as referenced in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Salmonid BiOp (National Marine Fisheries Service 2009) for coordinated operations of the SWP and CVP. It is unclear if this project could be used to offset impacts related to the intakes and therefore may not be a good project to reference.

h. Section 2.6: USACE has not received a copy of the March 2nd 2015 deliverable. Please provide a copy for our review.

Thank you,

Zachary M. Simmons

Biologist, Senior Regulatory Project Manager

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, Regulatory Division

1325 J Street, Room 1350, Sacramento, CA 95814

916-557-6746: FAX 916-557-7803

**Customer Survey: http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm_apex/f?p=regulatory_survey

**For more information visit: <http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory.aspx>

-----Original Message-----

From: Stine, Ann [<mailto:astine@usbr.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2015 3:07 PM

To: Clark, Susan S SPK; Nepstad, Michael G SPK; Skophammer, Stephanie; Erin Foresman

Cc: Michelle Banonis; Theresa Olson; Mary Lee Knecht

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Federal Cooperating Agency Review for the BDCP Recirculated EIR/Supplemental EIS

All, as you know DWR has been working on the Administrative Draft BDCP REIR/SEIS and as Cooperating Agencies we are sending you preliminary sections for your review. DWR has added some new sections that describe the revisions for this next iteration of the BDCP EIR/EIS. Attached are portions of Section 2.0 that discuss Fish and Aquatic Habitat, Water Quality, Environmental Commitments and a revised project description, a total of 14 pages (4 pages are on water quality). In addition I have attached Section 1.0 which introduces the general

approach to the recirculated BDCP for background information if needed. All edits/comments can be sent to me in track changes. These preliminary sections also contain placeholders and notes to reviewers from ICF which are denoted with highlighting and/or comment bubbles.

We received Section 2.0 this week and apologize for the short turn around but we would appreciate your comments by COB March 24 (next Tuesday). We will also request your review of the rest of the preliminary Administrative Draft REIR/SEIS which is expected to come out April 1. This too will have a short review period of a couple weeks. Please let me know if you have any questions. We appreciate your time and effort for this review. Ann

--

Ann Chrisney Stine

Natural Resource Specialist

Bay-Delta Office

801 I. St., Suite 140

Sacramento, California

(916) 414-2427